REMARKS:

Applicant is in receipt of the Final Office Action mailed October 31, 2007. Claims 73-92 were pending in the application. Claims 73, 84, and 89 have been amended. Claims 74, 82, 83, and 90 have been canceled. Claims 73, 75-81, 84-89, and 91-92 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 73-77, 79-84, and 89-92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obenhuber et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,144,638 (hereinafter "Obenhufer") in view of Farah ("Encrypted Hypertext Transfer Protocol –UGGC/1.0", April, 2000, Network Working Group) (hereinafter "Farah"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Amended claim 73 recites in pertinent part, "a request for a web page in a second Internet domain…wherein said request is directed to a first address hosted by the server within a third Internet domain, wherein said third Internet domain is different from said second Internet domain" and "responsive to said decrypting, said server retrieving the web page via the second Internet domain". Thus, the server hosts the first address in the third Internet domain, and the request for the web page is directed to the first address. However, the web page is associated with a second Internet domain that is different than the third Internet domain, and the server retrieves the web page via the second Internet domain. Applicant respectfully submits that Obenhufer and Farah, taken either singly or in combination, do not teach these limitations in combination with the other limitations recited in claim 73.

Obenhufer relates generally to a system for providing users with access to a network such as the Internet. Obenhufer teaches a multi-tenant unit that includes an encryption/decryption engine. The encryption/decryption engine encrypts each outgoing data packet and decrypts each incoming data packet. (Col. 4, lines 1-35). Thus, Obenhufer's encryption/decryption engine simply encrypts and decrypts the data exiting and entering the multi-tenant unit.

Farah relates generally to a protocol in which both the URLs and the data traveling between a client and server are encrypted. Farah teaches that a WWW client sends an encrypted URL in a request to a WWW server. Upon receipt of the request, the WWW server determines what it is being asked to return, processes it, encrypts it, and sends it back to the client. (Section 2.3, "User/client/server interaction", pp, 2-3).

These references, taken either singly or in combination, simply do not teach the recited

limitations of, "a request for a web page in a second Internet domain...wherein said request is directed to a first address hosted by the server within a third Internet domain, wherein said third Internet domain is different from said second Internet domain" and "responsive to said decrypting, said server retrieving the web page <u>via the second Internet domain</u>". Accordingly, even if there were a motivation to combine the cited references as suggested by the Examiner (and Applicant does not concede that this is the case), the combination proposed by the Examiner lacks the features of claim 73 recited above.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 73 is patentably distinct over Obenhufer and Farah for at least this reason.

Applicant also respectfully submits that Obenhufer and Farah do not teach the further limitations of:

> wherein said request is directed to a first address hosted by the server within a third Internet domain, wherein said third Internet domain is different from said second Internet domain, wherein said request includes a <u>URL including an encrypted address of said web page concatenated to an unencrypted form of the first address</u>;

With respect to these limitations, the Examiner states:

> "Obenhufer does not disclose wherein the request includes both an encrypted address of the web page and an unencrypted address of a third Internet domain that is different from said second Internet domain. However, Farah discloses encrypting the URL address or partially encrypting the URL address."

However, Farah does not teach a request that includes a <u>URL that includes an encrypted address of said web page concatenated to an unencrypted form of the first address</u>, as recited in amended claim 73. Thus, Obenhufer and Farah, taken either singly or in combination, do not teach this limitation of claim 73. Applicant thus respectfully submits that claim 73 is also patentably distinct over Obenhufer and Farah for at least this further reason.

Inasmuch as the independent claims 84 and 89 recite similar limitations as those discussed above with respect to claim 72, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are also patentably distinct over Obenhufer and Farah. Since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct over the cited art, Applicant submits that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct, for at least this reason. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that several of the dependent claims recite further distinctions not taught or suggested by the

cited references. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION:

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6002-03300/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2008   By: /Dean M. Munyon/
                                               Dean M. Munyon
                                               Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847